

REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of June 17, 2004.

Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

The Office Action

Claims 1-2, 4-16 and 18-28 remain in this application. Claims 3 and 17 are cancelled. Claims 1, 5, 14-16 and 18-28 have been amended. Claims 1-2, 4 and 6-13 remain as originally presented. No new matter has been added. The claims have been amended to conform with the Examiner's renumbering of claims 15-29 to claims 14-28, respectively. It is believed that the claims are in condition for allowance. As discussed below, the Examiner's rejections are traversed and favorable consideration is requested.

As indicated in the Office Action,

I. Claims 1, 2, 4, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helland et al. (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al. (US 6412008).

This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

The claims have been amended to more clearly define the claimed subject matter. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 15, and all claims that depend therefrom, have been amended to establish the claimed subject matter to include: "associate one or more of a plurality of work sites with each of said users, each worksite defining a group of users;" and "associate items with one or more of a plurality of work sites using validation rules;". The specification discusses these features on page 5, para. 1-2. The validation rules are used to associate items of inventory with specific work sites that define a work group of users. For example, a work site can be based on the user's geographical location and the validation rules may be used to associate items of inventory based on the jurisdictional requirements of the work sites geographical location. Insurance forms, medical forms, etc. are good examples of items that have

jurisdictional requirements based on state requirements.

As the Examiner indicated in the last office action, at page 7, second paragraph, "Helland et al. and Fields et al. do not teach a system wherein the server computer system further comprises a work site database associating at least one of a plurality of work sites with each of the plurality of users." Accordingly, Helland et al. and Fields et al. do not discuss a system or method for generating a requisition for user selectable items that includes a work site and validation rules as currently claimed in claims 1, 2, 4 and 15 of the present application.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

II. Claims 3, 5-12 and 17-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helland et al. (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al. (US 6412008) in further view of Huang et al. (US 6571245).

This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claims 3 and 17 are canceled.

As discussed above, the claims have been amended to more clearly define the claimed subject matter. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 15, and all claims that depend therefrom, including claims 5-12 and 18-26, have been amended to establish the claimed subject matter to include: "associate one or more of a plurality of work sites with each of said users, each worksite defining a group of users;" and "associate items with one or more of a plurality of work sites using validation rules;." The specification discusses these features on page 5, para. 1-2. The validation rules are used to associate items of inventory with specific work sites that define a work group of users. For example, a work site can be based on the user's geographical location and the validation rules may be used to associate items of inventory based on the jurisdictional requirements of the work sites geographical location. Insurance forms, medical forms, etc. are good examples of items that have jurisdictional requirements based on state requirements.

As the Examiner indicated in the last office action, at page 7, second paragraph, "Helland et al. and Fields et al. do not teach a system wherein the server computer system further comprises a work site database associating at

least one of a plurality of work sites with each of the plurality of users.”

Accordingly, Helland et al. and Fields et al. do not discuss a system or method for generating a requisition for user selectable items that includes a work site and validation rules as currently claimed in claims 5-12 and 18-26 of the present application.

The Examiner argues in the last office action, page 7, para. 2 that Huang et al. teaches a system wherein the server computer system further comprises a work site database associating at least one of a plurality of work sites with each of the plurality of users. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that Huang et al. teaches the use of a user personal web page retrieved from a file server and returned to a local system. As the Examiner has stated, Huang et al. teaches the use of a personal web page for the retrieval of information associated with a virtual desktop in a computer network. This is distinguished from the presently claimed subjected matter because the users, as claimed and described in the specification, are limited to what they can requisition based on the work site associated with the user. In other words, the present application is directed to a system of requisitioning items that limits the user's ability to requisition items based on validation rules. Accordingly, Helland et al. (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al. (US 6412008) in further view of Huang et al. (US 6571245) do not teach each and every element of claims 5-12 and 18-26, or claims 1, 2, 4, 13, 14, 15, 16, 27 and 28.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

III. Claims 13 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helland et al. (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al. (US 6412008) in further view of Huang et al. (US 6571245) in further view of Lee et al. (US 6611814).

This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

As discussed above, the claims have been amended to more clearly define the claimed subject matter. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 15, and all claims that depend therefrom, including claims 13 and 27 respectively, have been amended to establish the claimed subject matter to include:

“associate one or more of a plurality of work sites with each of said users, each worksite defining a group of users;” and “associate items with one or more of a plurality of work sites using validation rules;.” The specification discusses these features on page 5, para. 1-2. The validation rules are used to associate items of inventory with specific work sites that define a work group of users. For example, a work site can be based on the user’s geographical location and the validation rules may be used to associate items of inventory based on the jurisdictional requirements of the work sites geographical location. Insurance forms, medical forms, etc. are good examples of items that have jurisdictional requirements based on state requirements.

Accordingly, Helland et al. (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al. (US 6412008) in further view of Huang et al. (US 6571245) do not teach each and every element of claims 5 and 15. Therefore, the elements of claims 13 and 27, which depend from claims 5 and 15 respectively, are not taught by Helland et al. (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al. (US 6412008) in further view of Huang et al. (US 6571245) in further view of Lee et al. (US 6611814).

The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

IV. Claims 14 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helland et al. (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al. (US 6412008) in further view of Huang et al. (US 6571245) in further view of Walker et al. (US 6466919).

This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

As discussed above, the claims have been amended to more clearly define the claimed subject matter. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 15, and all claims that depend therefrom, including claims 14 and 28 respectively, have been amended to establish the claimed subject matter to include:

“associate one or more of a plurality of work sites with each of said users, each worksite defining a group of users;” and “associate items with one or more of a plurality of work sites using validation rules;.” The specification discusses these features on page 5, para. 1-2. The validation rules are used to associate items of inventory with specific work sites that define a work group of users. For

example, a work site can be based on the user's geographical location and the validation rules may be used to associate items of inventory based on the jurisdictional requirements of the work sites geographical location. Insurance forms, medical forms, etc. are good examples of items that have jurisdictional requirements based on state requirements.

Accordingly, Helland et al. (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al. (US 6412008) in further view of Huang et al. (US 6571245) do not teach each and every element of claims 5 and 15. Therefore, the elements of claims 14 and 28, which depend from claims 5 and 17 respectively, are not taught by Helland et al. (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al. (US 6412008) in further view of Huang et al. (US 6571245) in further view of Walker et al. (US 6466919).

The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

CONCLUSION


For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-2, 4-16 and 18-28) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

The undersigned attorney of record hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Deposit Account No. 24-0037.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Jeffrey Zahn, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP



Patrick R. Roche, Reg. No. 29,580
Jeffrey N. Zahn, Reg. No. 54,864
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582

15 Oct 2004

Date